

REMARKS

Claims 1-55 were pending at the time of the last Office Action. Applicant has canceled claims 25-39 and 48-55 and amended claims 1, 13 and 40. Thus, claims 1-24 and 40-47 are now pending.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for her consideration during the telephone interview of October 31, 2007. During that interview, applicant's representative discussed the proposed amendments to the claims. Applicant has added clarifying language to independent claims 13 and 40. Applicant has also amended the claims to make it clear that the display description file specified a display description using a display description language (e.g., XML or HTML).

Applicant hereby withdraws the traversal of the restriction requirement of June 14, 2007.

Applicant is submitting a replacement drawing for Figure 1 as requested by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Apparently, the Examiner believes that claim 9 depends from claim 8, which also uses the terms "a cell" and "a child element." Claim 9, however, depends not from claim 8, but rather from claim 7. As a result, it is clear that these terms in claim 9 are not referring to anything mentioned in claim 8.

The Examiner has rejected claims 40-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended the claims to address the Examiner's concerns.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-24 and 40-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by O'Brien. Although applicant disagrees, applicant has amended the claims to further clarify the subject matter being claimed.

In particular, applicant has amended claims 1-24 and 40-47 to make it clear that the "definition of the element," "a first condition and a first layout for the definition of the element" and "a second condition and a second layout for the definition of the element" are included in "a display description file." For example, claim 1 recites "providing a display description file that includes: a definition of the element; a first condition and a first layout for the definition of the element; and a second condition and a second layout for the definition of the element."

O'Brien, in contrast, describes that a user can define rules for formatting that are stored separately from the content to which the rules are to be applied. Moreover, the rules are common in the sense that they are applied to many different sources of content. O'Brien's rules are stored in a "design data set" that

can be used with a range of different source contents 110." "This allows one design data set 130 to be used in the Publishing Engine 140 of any number of works which may form a consistent series. For example, a series of books produced by a single academic textbook publisher can all be produced using the same design data set 130, resulting in a whole series of works which conform to a single style.

(O'Brien, 18:20-29.)

Assuming, for the sake of argument, that O'Brien's rules correspond to the claimed conditions and layout, O'Brien fails to teach or suggest that the rules are included in a "display description file" that also include "a definition of an element" to which the rules apply.

Based upon the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any

questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8548.

Applicant believes the required fees are being paid with this response. However, if any additional fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 418268006US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: 2-13-08

Respectfully submitted,

By Maurice J. Pirio
Maurice J. Pirio

Registration No.: 33,273
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant